

wants that gap to be addressed through legislation.

The bill before us evidently is intended to respond to that request. It would make clear that no warrant or court order is required for our intelligence agencies to monitor communications between people located outside the United States, even if those communications pass through the United States or the surveillance device is located within the United States. The point of this clarification is to resolve doubts about the status of communications between foreign persons located overseas that pass through routing stations here in the United States.

I have no reservation in supporting this clarification to help resolve questions related to changes in communications technology since enactment of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA. And I think it is useful that the bill reiterates that individual warrants, based on probable cause, are required when surveillance is directed at individuals in the United States.

The bill requires the Attorney General to submit procedures for international surveillance to the FISA Court for approval and authorizes the court to issue a "basket warrant" for individuals or foreign powers, including al Qaeda, outside the United States based on a review of those procedures without making separate determinations about individuals to be subject to the surveillance. Under the bill, there would be an initial 15-day period when international surveillance can begin while a "basket warrant" is submitted to the FISA Court. It allows for up to two 15-day extensions while the court rules and allows the court to compel cooperation by carriers during that period. And it requires the Justice Department's Inspector General to conduct and provide to the court and the Congress an audit every 60 days of communications involving any U.S. persons that are intercepted under a "basket warrant."

In general, I am wary of the concept of "basket warrants," which are not normal under our laws. But I am prepared to support this part of the bill on the understanding that it is limited in scope and not applicable within the United States and with the expectation that the question will be revisited if the audits indicate a need for reconsideration of this part of the legislation. In this context, I am glad to note that this legislation will expire in 120 days. I think that is appropriate in light of the very short time we have had to consider the bill and the importance of the subject. This sunset clause means that we will be required to revisit the issue and will reduce the likelihood that any errors caused by today's expedited procedure will persist for an undue period.

Madam Speaker, the administration is not fully supportive of this bill and evidently would prefer a broader grant of authority for surveillance. I am prepared to consider their arguments, but in the meantime I will vote for this bill in order to provide an immediate response to the problem they have identified and to advance the measure to the Senate for further consideration.

ENSURING MILITARY READINESS THROUGH STABILITY AND PREDICTABILITY DEPLOYMENT POLICY ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. TODD TIAHRT

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 2007

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3159, the so-called "Ensuring Military Readiness through Stability and Predictability Deployment Policy Act of 2007." This ill-conceived and dangerous piece of legislation will lead to American troops stuck in Iraq with no reinforcements and no replacements.

All Americans long for the day when our troops can return from foreign lands. With U.S. troops deployed in over 35 countries around the world, their families count the days until their loved ones come home. However, our Nation must never lose sight that each soldier, sailor, airman, and marine has a mission to complete: to protect the citizens and interests of the United States.

H.R. 3159 has a lofty goal that is supported by every American, every Member of Congress, the Secretary of Defense and the President: to provide time at home to Iraq for our men and women in uniform between deployments. This legislation would require a one-to-one ratio between deployments in Iraq and home station for active duty forces, and a one-to-three ratio for National Guard and Reserve. However, the Department of Defense, DoD, currently has higher standards of a one-to-two ratio between all deployments, regardless of location, for active forces and a one-to-five ratio for Reserve forces.

So, the question must be asked, why has H.R. 3159, with its lesser standards than DoD's own standards, elicited a Presidential veto, opposition from the U.S. Military leadership, and widespread resistance in Congress? Because this legislation is a political ruse and would do serious harm to our troops in Iraq and our national security.

Although this legislation would prohibit back-to-back deployments to Iraq, H.R. 3159 still would allow troops to deploy to Iraq and then to another nation, such as Afghanistan or the Philippines, without restriction. Let me be clear, contrary to the arguments of the Democrats, this legislation would not ensure dwell times for our troops.

However, it will do real harm to our troops in Iraq—leaving our troops without reinforcements and without replacements. H.R. 3159 would hinder the flexibility of Pentagon leaders to place troops where they are needed, and when they are needed. This legislation would not change the mission in Iraq or decrease the required number of troops. But it will force our troops to stay in Iraq longer—waiting for their replacements. And if additional troops are required—this bill would hinder any reinforcements from arriving in a timely fashion. Holding our troops without replacements or reinforcements does not constitute support, as Democrats have asserted.

Although it is true this bill includes a waiver provision—it only allows troops to be deployed after a 30-day congressional notification. During war, time is always of the essence. Throughout history, many battles and lives

have been lost due to delays in reinforcements or replacements. When our military commanders urgently request a special operations or explosive ordnance disposal team, our President and military leadership needs to have the flexibility to send that team immediately. Under this legislation, the President would have to provide notification to Congress, wait 30 days, and then send these urgently needed forces. This is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous times for our troops and for our Nation. Our military commanders need the flexibility to effectively and safely carry out the will of this Nation. We must not hamstring our Nation's warriors. Therefore, I ask all my colleagues to join with me in opposition to this bill.

CELEBRATING NEW YORK'S AFRICAN DAY PARADE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 4, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, today I rise up to honor what is expected to be an exciting first in the history of my congressional district—New York's first ever African Day Parade and Street Festival this Sunday, August 5, 2007.

I can think of no better place to hold such an event than in the village of Harlem. Although many people around the world hold common African value and traditions, unity of purpose and a shared history does not equal a monolithic culture. Too often "Africa" is presented without the richness of diversity, an oversight that helps continue backward stereotypes and misconceptions.

This event presents a unique opportunity for all New Yorkers to learn about the different cultures within the continent's diaspora. It will bring together a wide range of representatives from dance groups and vendors to fashion designers, writers and musicians—all of whom promise to showcase their own perspective of the continent's tapestry.

This grand celebration is also a great opportunity for our recently arrived African brothers and sisters to build bridges—both within their smaller communities, but also with their African American and Latino cousins. Only by growing these relationships can we achieve common goals and dreams. Only by working together can we move closer to the country and the world that all our children need and deserve.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2272, AMERICA COMPETES ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to strongly support the conference report for H.R. 2272, the America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education and Science, COMPETES, Act of 2007.

Science, technology, engineering, and math STEM, research and education are the key to